

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

DATE

13-2456

DIR-3927

27 AUG 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Management and Services

SUBJECT : The Foreign Affairs Executive Seminar:
Costing Components

Reference your comment at last Wednesday's Morning Meeting that perhaps components ought to refund the cost of a session of the Foreign Affairs Executive Seminar (FAES) for failure to meet their quotas:

1. I suggest we not do this. First off, there are no specified quotas for the directorate. Mr. Colby, following a Deputies Meeting on 19 September 1972, eliminated them--tho this is not to say of course that they can not now be reinstated, if he can be persuaded differently. (His memo to Hugh Cunningham on the subject is attached.) Secondly, the funding system could become awkward, particularly in the process of specifying a sum and recovering it from the defaulting directorates. OTR has always budgeted for the FAES and really has had no problems with it. I don't think it is necessary to change the system at this point.

2. There is a long history of quotas and funding. It all started in 1963, when the Seminar first began, and General Carter, then DDCI, established CIA's representation at eight for each of the six-yearly sessions. His action was followed by an internal determination that the DDO would fill four of the eight slots; the remainder to be the responsibility of the other directorates. Later, in 1969, Colonel White, as Executive Director-Comptroller, asked State to cut us back 50 percent. As far as we have ever been able to determine he never received a reply.

The most recent action was in 1971 when, in informal sessions with Hugh Cunningham and with

time, Howard Haugerud, the Seminar's Director, left CIA's quotas open-ended: we could send more

STAT

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INFORMATION USE ONLY

than eight to a session, if we had the candidates, but if at all possible, we should send at least one for each of the five area seminars that make up the three-week program. Our quota of eight would thus remain only the device for determining our shared cost.

In practice, neither CIA nor any other civilian Agency has met its quota commitment. Until FY 73, CIA's quota was 14% of the total--and we averaged close to 14% of student enrollments (30); and the charge was \$11,742. In FY 73, the percentage went up to 15% of the FAES budget (estimated at just under \$300,000); with CIA's share being \$12,131, about \$330 for each of 37 officers we sent--a small fee, on balance, for an excellent foreign affairs course.

3. I referred to Mr. Colby's memo earlier. A second attachment is a longer paper, responding to questions Mr. Colby had about the Seminar. Perhaps now is the time for him to restate his position on the FAES, including the matter of quotas. (Of particular coincidence is that on the same Wednesday of your meeting with us, [redacted] Senior Training Officer of the DDO, [redacted] OTR's Registrar, to say that Bill Nelson intends to provide two officers for each of the Seminars. This may be the place for Mr. Colby to begin.) He may also want to reiterate his thoughts about the Seminar with respect to the one-Agency theme and to expanding our relationships with the Community. And I would most certainly urge his directing inclusion of the program in career development plans the Deputies are developing for their officers.

[redacted]

Alfonso Rodriguez/
Director of Training

Atts

ONE GS-15
SALARY OFFER
OUTMAN ON THE
STAFF

STAT

STAT

STAT

73-1111
11-7980

4 October 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

THROUGH

Deputy Director for Support 5 OCT 1972

SUBJECT

: Foreign Affairs Executive Seminar

REFERENCE

: Memo to ExDir from DD/S dtd 6 July 1972,
Same Subject

1. Based on the distribution of referent memorandum to the Deputies and the discussion at the Deputies Meeting on 19 September, I believe the following conclusions are appropriate:

a. We will continue to participate in the FAES, to support it financially at current levels, and to provide visits to CIA and lecturers as requested.

✓ b. We will not have a solid quota for each directorate for attendance at the Seminar, but we should solicit the positive interest of the directorates in sending their people to the Seminar as a way of breaking out of any possible parochialism and expanding their relationships within the foreign affairs community.

c. The Office of Training should integrate the FAES into the career training pattern being developed by the various directorates or career services. Obviously, it is not necessary for all CIA officers, but it would seem highly desirable for certain of our officers who will be closely involved with other members of the foreign policy community or work here at home.

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP84-00780R005600030005-5

- 2 -

2. In other words, I think we should consider the FAES as a quasi-internal course rather than one of external training with all that it implies. I would hope that the Training Board of Visitors would include it in its annual review and that I would be kept regularly informed of our participation in FAES.

25X1



W. E. Colby

Executive Director-Comptroller

cc: Director of Personnel
DD/I
DD/P
DD/S&T
DD/S
General Counsel
Inspector General ✓

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP84-00780R005600030005-5

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Director-Comptroller

SUBJECT : Foreign Affairs Executive Seminar

REFERENCE : (a) Memo dtd 12 Jan 72 to DD/S from
ExDir-Compt, same subject
(b) Memo dtd 23 Feb to ExDir-Compt
from DD/S, DD/S 72-0646

1. In your memorandum dated 12 January 1972, you asked for comments on five points concerning the new Foreign Affairs Executive Seminar. On 23 February in a memorandum to you confirming our telephone conversation, I mentioned that the information developed thus far by the Office of Training was based on a single running of the Seminar and that we ought to have some additional experience to avoid what perhaps could be necessarily subjective views. I said we would come back to you in approximately three months.

2. This memorandum now responds to your January paper. It is based on the experience of three runnings, January, March, and May, to which the Agency sent 16 officers in grades GS-15 (2), GS-14 (10), and GS-13 (4) and who represented three directorates: Clandestine Service, 4; Intelligence, 5; Support, 7. It is also based on reports submitted by 14 of the 16 participants (Attachment A) who responded to questions on the value of the FAES to the Agency, the visits to Headquarters, and the value of the Seminar to each, professionally. (We have not as yet heard from one of the GS officers who because of the fatal illness of his wife has not been available to submit a report. The other, a Support careerist, left for overseas shortly after completing the March session.)

3. Hugh was to have discussed the reduction of the Agency's quota at a meeting of the Training Committee. Chairman Haugerud called only one meeting during the six months, in April. The subject of quotas was

CONFIDENTIAL

not on the agenda and, from what Hugh understands, both Secretary Irwin and Mr. Haugerud see them as important now only in determining shared costs. High-quality participation and a solid foreign affairs program are their priorities. This view was also borne out in [] informal discussion with Howard when he told Bob that meeting our quota wasn't essential, more important is our participation, that is, visits to Headquarters, and if possible, providing a participant for each of the regional seminars.

25X1

4. As noted in paragraph 7d, Hugh did not consult with the Deputy Directors to determine whether or not the FAES should be integrated into career development, preferring instead to await a final decision on the proposal concerning training and career planning.

5. From what has been said of the new FAES by the Agency's participants, we should continue in full support of it. As recast, it has become a truly foreign affairs program, dealing with national and international issues and problems of direct concern to CIA. Reports attest to its value in breaking down a parochialism common to the professional existence of many of our people and in its providing the opportunity to set the record straight when the Agency's place in foreign policy determinations is at issue.

6. It is time, I think, for the Agency to recognize the value of the FAES and to stimulate appropriate attendance. Our alternative is to either withdraw altogether or to continue giving it partial, haphazard support; both of these seem to damage CIA's own opportunity to improve its relationships with the Community and its officers' knowledge of foreign policy problems.

7. Addressing the points you specifically raised in your memorandum:

a. Comments made by CIA personnel who have attended the Seminar to date:

In more than 120 critiques prepared on the Seminars conducted through 1971, only six, all D careerists, were over-all negative. Two officers suggested withdrawal. (One, Tom Polgar, who attended in October 1968, concluded that the Seminar had outlived its usefulness. The second, [] then in CFPB and who was in the April 1969 running, said unqualifiedly that we should withdraw.) Of particular significance is that all of the complaints were made about the Seminar as it was before the Training Committee made the first major change in mid-1969 to bring the coverage into line with President Nixon's new policy on underdeveloped countries. Those who criticized the Seminar, in other words, were doing so when the emphasis was on counterinsurgency.

25X1

Since the new FAES was introduced in January, in the reports from our participants the most negative remark is that the one-half day at Headquarters is too short to justify transporting sixty people from Rosslyn to Langley.

b. The new posture of the FAES in relation to the value of the changes made:

In his letter of 6 January to Mr. Helms and to the other heads of foreign affairs agencies and government departments, Undersecretary Irwin cited the Seminar as intending to provide an advanced, short-term (3 weeks) course on the U.S. and national security policy for senior foreign affairs executives in government offices in the United States and abroad, and, to broaden the perspective of foreign affairs executives.

The Seminar is divided into four phases. The first puts heavy emphasis on existing U.S. foreign and national security policy, with particular attention to an elaboration of the Nixon Doctrine and to foreign economic and trade policies in the light of the new U.S. economic policy. Special emphasis is given to the decision-making process in national security and the relative roles of the White House and the other foreign affairs agencies. The second phase concerns the ways of maintaining the stability of the developing countries during their processes of emergence. The third segment brings in the domestic factors that affect formulation and implementation of foreign policy (e.g. elections, youth, the press, and the environment), and the last phase deals with foreign policy problems and strategies.

Undersecretary Irwin has formalized the FAES by making it a new school in the Foreign Service Institute.

c. Value of the Seminar to CIA personnel, with reference to the differing needs and interests of each Directorate:

Except for State's Senior Seminar on Foreign Policy (SSFP), the National War College (NWC), and short courses in CIA, the FAES is the best opportunity for our CIA officers. It has two distinct advantages over the SSFP and NWC. One is the duration: three weeks versus 10 months. The second is the number of participants. We can profitably send 43 to FAES as opposed to two for the SSFP and four for NWC.

While OTR is steadily concerned with the subject of foreign affairs, the FAES has the greater advantage in that our people can get a more comprehensive view of the whole problem of foreign affairs from the Community standpoint—an approach not appropriate in courses OTR now conducts. The Seminar also provides our people an opportunity to mix with officers from the other agencies, finding among them those officers with whom they may be working overseas. Another very important advantage is the opportunity for our CIA participants to contribute substantively in the formal and informal discussions and to correct any misconceptions that may arise about the real role of CIA within the foreign affairs community.

Looking at the FAES from the standpoints of the new role of CIA in the Intelligence Community and the new direction now given to the Seminar, the Seminar emerges as a program well-suited to our officers in grade GS-14 and above, regardless of career service, who are proceeding on assignment overseas, under official cover, especially for those going overseas for the first time; secondly, for the CS desk officer in an Area Division or on a Staff; for the the area specialists, and the analysts in the DDI; estimates officers, S&T specialists named to attend an international conference or to serve on a U.S. delegation; and for the Support careerists in an administrative capacity. (State sends many of its administrative officers.) A separate group for whom the Seminar is appropriate is OTR's instructors, particularly those whose responsibilities require updating on foreign affairs.

25X1

d. Consultation with each directorate as to whether and how the FAES should be or should not be integrated into the career development of its officers:

A formal effort to talk to the Deputy Directors about the FAES as part of career development was not undertaken by the DTR. Such an effort, however, may well have been overtaken by events. With the proposed profile of courses now under study and the likelihood that each of the directorates will go on from the basic proposal to establish a directorate-profile, the FAES can be put alongside the senior schools and the CIA Senior Seminar as an appropriate program for midcareer and senior officers. I note that the Department of State has tied the Seminar into its regular career development training. Secretary Irwin, in his letter to his bureau and office heads, specified that they are "required to program their key personnel" into the Seminar and that this is

"true for personnel being considered for Chiefs of Mission, DCMs, Heads of Mission sections, Consul Generals, Bureau and office heads, Country Directors, and Desk Officers."

e. Contributions to the Seminar by CIA personnel:

(1) Staff and Faculty

The Seminar is interdepartmentally staffed, with each participating agency contributing a resident faculty member. There are five such members with each responsible for arranging regional sessions, monitoring them, advising on course content, providing speakers and reading materials, and occasionally filling in as a lecturer.

OTR has always had a representative. [] has been there since July 1971 and upon his retirement at the end of this June will be replaced by [] also a Training careerist. Joe has had eight years in the CS, six of which were overseas, and most recently was on the staff of the CIA Senior Seminar, participating in its organization and seeing it through its second running.

(2) Visiting Lecturers and Visits to CIA

Upon request, CIA provides area and functional specialists (about five) to lead discussions in the regional seminars. In addition are the visits to Headquarters, with each of these involving presentations by four senior officers.

Visits to CIA were part of the original seminar beginning in May 1962 and continuing through May of 1963. At the request of Chairman Haugerud last July they were reinstated, Howard believing them to be highly important to the success of his program. In the reports from our participants all have given the visits high marks and have voiced the reactions of their seminar-mates in noting CIA's candor, no "over-kill," and the professionalism of both the presentations and their substance.

(3) Finances

The funding is shared by the member agencies, each contributing a percentage of the annual operating budget. The share is keyed to the member's quota. Exclusive of the salary of the faculty representative, now to be a GS-15/4, and which OTR pays, the reimbursable expense to the Agency has ranged from a five-year high of \$32,634 in FY 69 to a low of \$11,742 in FY 72. The estimated reimbursable cost for FY 73 is \$18,000 (Attachment B). The FY 72 figure

averages \$355 for each participant. We sent 33. Based on the current quota of 40, in FY 73 each participant will cost us \$375.

(4) Student Quota

CIA's quota of eight was established by General Carter in his memorandum of April 1963 to the DD/P. Later it was determined that the OS would fill four of the eight slots in each session; the remainder would come from the other directorates. In December 1969, in a memorandum to the Deputy Directors, Colonel White restated our commitment of eight and in his letter of 23 July 1971 to Van Langley on the Planning and Coordination Staff of the Department of State, he asked for a 50% reduction. No formal response was sent to CIA by Mr. Langley.

John W. Coffey
Deputy Director
for Support

Atts

Distribution:

- O & 1 - Adse.
- 2 - DD/S
- 2 - DTR
- 1 - EA/P

25X1

OTR/JWC/[] kaj (29 June 72)

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

The foreign Affairs Executive Seminar: Costing Components **DIR-8927**

FROM:

Director of Training
1026 CofC

EXTENSION

NO.

STAT

DATE

27 August 1973

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DD/M&S
7-D-26 - Hqs.

8/28

[Signature]

I have already sent copies of Mr. Colby's memo on FAES (attd) to the Senior Training Officers to remind them of his recommendation that the Seminar should be considered a quasi-internal course. The info should be helpful to them in planning training for their people.

I have also sent a copy to Dr. Chamberlain in his new role as Chairman of the Board of Visitors.

AR